

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 94 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Ant Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-ant@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Ant-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Ant@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Ant Digest V94 #210
To: Ham-Ant

Ham-Ant Digest Mon, 4 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 210

Today's Topics:

 A Question on Yagi's.
 DB .vs. Celwave

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Ant@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Ant-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Ant Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-ant".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 3 Jul 94 11:27:00 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!iat.holonet.net!wwswinc!
art.harris@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: A Question on Yagi's.
To: ham-ant@ucsd.edu

In <2ui2la\$p6k@proffa.cc.tut.fi>, Paul Keinanen
<Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.Mailnet.fi> replied to:

Jon Tara (jtara@cts.com)

>Are the FM transmitters really circularly polarized ? I have only heard
>of circular polarized TV-transmitter tests in urban areas to reduce ghosts.
>Assuming that a specific FM-transmitter is either horizontally or
>vertically polarized, find out what your transmitter is using and
>orientate your antenna accordingly. There is no point of using circular
>polarisation if you want to receive a single station.

FM broadcasters in the US do NOT use circular polarization; however,
they do split their power equally into horizontal and vertical

components. The purpose is to serve people listening at home using horizontal antennas, and people listening in their cars with vertical antennas. Cross-polarization between receive and transmit antennas would cause up to 20 db of signal loss.

Art, N2AH
Art.Harris@Woodybbs.com

Date: Sun, 3 Jul 1994 06:07:10
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news2.sprintlink.net!news.sprintlink.net!
nwnexus!olympus.net!olympus.net!vaughnwt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: DB .vs. Celwave
To: ham-ant@ucsd.edu

> A few weeks ago I requested comments regarding dual-band antennas for
>repeater usage on repeaters in very harsh environments. The results of that
>survey lead me to the conclusion that no suitable dual-band antenna exists
>for longevity in harsh environments.

> The time has come for our ham club to replace our repeater antennas
>(after 15 years of service, current antennas are both db-220 and
>phelps-dodge super-stationmaster). We are again discussing the db products
>4 bay vs the Celwave PD-200 antennas (VHF 146 range). My local enquires and
>combined experiences have taught me that the 4 bay (or more) antennas work
>very well, but need frequent cleaning (yearly). The phelps-dodge antennas
>seem to be more reliable over years of neglect. We would like to make a
>good decision.

>Has anyone else traveled this path that could offer some opinions?
>I'd also appreciate comments from users of small phased beam arrays for
>repeater antennas (what type of beams, how many, what pattern you were
>trying to achieve, etc.,etc.)

>Thanks

>Terry Bartholomew NQ4Y

Terry, I have never put up a amateur repeater antenna. All of my experience has been commercial. I suppose you know phelps dodge was bought by Celwave a few years back. In my experience once you put up the celwave your job is over. Land mobile apps do not seem to effect these pups. I have seen these things picked up out of the wreckage of fallen towers and put back in service with no subsequent problems. In the marine service they last a long time, how long? I don't know I have never had the opportunity to change one. I did change one once but I was wrong and it wasn't the antenna.(blush) I have not had very

much luck with the db products steer away from them. Thats all.

William Vaughn vaughnwt@olympus.net "Just plain Bill."

End of Ham-Ant Digest V94 #210
